

townsend.

San Francisco, California
Tel 415.576.0200

Walnut Creek, California
Tel 925.472.6000

San Diego, California
Tel 858.350.6100

Denver, Colorado
Tel 303.571.4000

Seattle, Washington
Tel 206.467.9600

Washington, DC
Tel 202.481.9900

Tokyo, Japan
Tel +81.3.3507.5609

Palo Alto

379 Lytton Avenue
Palo Alto
California 94301-1431
Tel 650.326.2400
Fax 650.326.2422

FACSIMILE COVER SHEET

Date: February 12, 2010	Client & Matter Number: 019959-001900US	No. Pages (including this one): 4
To: Examiner, Virginia Ho	At Fax Number: 1-571-270-8309	Confirmation Phone Number:
From: Andrew J. Lee		(3778)

Message:

Re: Application No.: 10/668,455, Filed September 23, 2003

Please find attached an Informal Communication regarding the Agenda for Interview for the above-identified matter.

Original Will:	<input type="checkbox"/>	BE SENT BY MAIL	<input type="checkbox"/>	BE SENT BY COURIER	<input type="checkbox"/>	BE SENT BY MESSENGER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NOT BE SENT
----------------	--------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	--------------------	--------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------

Faxed: Return to: **Andrew J. Lee - (22351)**

If you have problems with reception please call Fax Services at **(650) 326-2400**

Important

This message is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, and/or exempt from disclosure by applicable law or court order. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication is **strictly prohibited**. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by telephone and return the original message to us at the above address via the United States Postal Service. Thank you.

Informal Communication

To: Examiner Virginia Ho
Fax: 571-270-8309

From: Andrew Lee (Reg. No. 60,371), 650-324-6351
Townsend and Townsend and Crew LLP

Date: February 12, 2010

Re: Application No. 10/668,455 filed September 23, 2003
Agenda for Interview scheduled for February 16, 2010 at 2:30PM EST

Examiner Ho:

Please find below an outline of the points I propose to discuss in an interview for the above referenced application.

I. Section 103 Rejection of Independent Claim 1

A. Proposed amendments to claim 1

1. (Currently Amended) A method comprising:
identifying, by a network device, a first port of the network device as a management port, the first port having a gateway address;
identifying, by the network device, a second port of the network device as a non-management port; and
filtering, by the network device, ~~management data packets received on the second port~~ a data packet received on the second port if a destination IP address of the data packet corresponds to the gateway address of the first port and if the data packet utilizes a management protocol.
1. Support for these amendments can be found in the Specification at, for example, FIG. 3 and page 9, line 30 to page 10, line 15.

To: Examiner Virginia Ho
Fax: 571-270-8309
From: Andrew Lee (Reg. No. 60,371), 650-324-6351

February 12, 2010
Page 2

B. Distinguishing features of amended claim 1 over the cited art

1. Chrysanthakopoulos and Haviland fail to teach or suggest “filtering, by the network device, a data packet received on the second port if a destination IP address of the data packet corresponds to the gateway address of the first port...” as recited in claim 1. (Emphasis added). No disclosure pertaining to this particular feature could be found in either of these references.
2. In rejecting dependent claim 2, the Office Action asserts that Blewett teaches the concept of “determining if a destination IP address for a data packet received on the second port corresponds to the gateway address of the first port.” (Office Action: pg. 11).
 - a) Applicants respectfully disagree. First, Applicants submit that the general notion of a rule table for accepting/dropping packets (as described in Blewett) does not teach or suggest the specific concept of filtering a data packet received on a one port of a network device (e.g., the recited second port of claim 1) if the destination IP address of the data packet corresponds to a gateway address of another port on the same network device (e.g., the recited first port of claim 1). For example, as best understood, nowhere does the cited section of Blewett specifically indicate that a packet received on one port of the security gateway will be dropped if the destination IP address of the packet matches the gateway address of another port on the same security gateway.
 - b) Second, there is no rationale for modifying Chrysanthakopoulos with Blewett (or any other reference) to teach “filtering... a data packet received on the second port if a destination IP address of the data packet corresponds to the gateway address of the first port...” as recited in claim 1.

To: Examiner Virginia Ho
Fax: 571-270-8309
From: Andrew Lee (Reg. No. 60,371), 650-324-6351

February 12, 2010
Page 3

- (1) In Chrysanthakopoulos, the determination of whether to process or drop a management command is based solely on the identity of the device port on which the command is received; other information, such as intended destination, is irrelevant. Accordingly, there is no reason for the computing device of Chrysanthakopoulos to determine if destination information included in a received management command points to the management port – if the command is received on a non-management port, the command will be dropped regardless of its intended destination.

II. Section 103 Rejection of Independent Claim 12

A. Distinguishing features of claim 12 over the cited art

1. Claim 12 recites, in part:

a control component configured to:

...

if the destination IP address corresponds to the gateway IP address of the management port, determine if the data packet originated from a management virtual local area network (VLAN), wherein the management VLAN includes the management port;

if the data packet did not originate from the management VLAN, determine if the data packet uses a management protocol;

2. The Office Action asserts that these features are shown by Haviland at page 15, column 1. (Office Action: pg. 12). However, this section of Haviland merely states in general terms that a VLAN can be used to control access to management traffic.
3. Applicants submit that the general notion of using a VLAN for management traffic does not teach or suggest the specific feature of determining if a data packet originated from a management VLAN that includes a management port if the destination IP address of the packet corresponds to the gateway IP address of the management port or the specific feature of determining if a data packet uses a management protocol if the data packet did not originate from the management VLAN.